arXiv:1301.5663v1 [math.NT] 23 Jan 2013

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE VARIANCE OF PRIMES IN ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS

DANIEL FIORILLI

Abstract. Hooley conjectured that the variance $V(x;q)$ of the distribution of primes up to x in the arithmetic progressions modulo q is asymptotically $x\log q$, in some unspecified range of $q\le x$. On average over $1\le q\le Q$, this conjecture is known unconditionally in the range $x/(\log x)^A\le Q\le x$; this last range can be improved to $x^{\frac12+\epsilon}\le Q\le x$ under the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH). We argue that Hooley's conjecture should hold down to $(\log\log x)^{1+o(1)}\le q\le x$ *for all values of* q, and that this range is best possible. We show under GRH and a linear independence hypothesis on the zeros of Dirichlet L-functions that for moderate values of q, $\phi(q)e^{-y}V(e^y;q)$ has the same distribution as that of a certain random variable of mean asymptotically $\phi(q)\log q$ and of variance asymptotically $2\phi(q)(\log q)^2$. Our estimates on the large deviations of this random variable allow us to predict the range of validity of Hooley's Conjecture.

1. Introduction

Define the variance of the distribution of primes in arithmetic progressions as[1]

$$V(x;q):=\sum_{\substack{a \bmod q\\(a,q)=1}}\left|\psi(x;q,a)-\frac{\psi(x,\chi_0)}{\phi(q)}\right|^2.$$

The study of this important quantity has a long history. One of the major applications of the large sieve is the Barban-Davenport-Halberstam Theorem [Ba, DH, G], which asserts that the average of $V(x;q)$ over $1\le q\le Q$ is $O(x\log Q)$, in the range $x/(\log x)^A\le Q\le x$. An asymptotic result in this range was first obtained by Montgomery [Mo1], who showed that for any fixed A, we have for $Q\le x$ that

$$\frac{1}{Q}\sum_{q\le Q}V(x;q)=x\log x+O_A\left(x\log(2x/Q)+\frac{x^2}{Q(\log x)^A}\right). \tag{1}$$

This estimate was refined by Hooley [H2], who showed that in the same range,

$$\frac{1}{Q}\sum_{q\le Q}V(x;q)=x\log Q-cx+O_A\left(Q^{\frac14}x^{\frac34}+\frac{x^2}{Q(\log x)^A}\right), \tag{2}$$

where $c=\gamma+\log(2\pi)+1+\sum_p\frac{\log p}{p(p-1)}$. Hooley [H2, H3] also showed that the error term in (2) could be replaced by $O_\epsilon(Q^{\frac14}x^{\frac34}+x^{\frac32+\epsilon}/Q)$ under the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH), extending the range of validity of the asymptotic $\frac{1}{Q}\sum_{q\le Q}V(x;q)\sim x\log Q$ to

---

[1] This variance is sometimes defined with $\psi(x;\chi_0)$ replaced by either x or $\psi(x)$, however these definitions are all equivalent for our purpose, which is to study the validity of the asymptotic $V(x;q)\sim x\log q$.

$x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} < Q \leq x$. The most precise result so far under GRH is that of Goldston and Vaughan [GV], which states that for $Q \leq x$,

$$\frac{1}{Q}\sum_{q\leq Q} V(x;q) = x\log Q - cx + O_\epsilon\left(Q(x/Q)^{\frac{1}{4}+\epsilon} + \frac{x^{\frac{3}{2}}}{Q}(\log 2x)^{\frac{5}{2}}(\log\log 3x)^2\right). \qquad (3)$$

As for individual values of q, Hooley [H7, H1] conjectured that in some range of $q \leq x$ we have

$$V(x;q) \sim x\log q. \qquad (4)$$

It is still an open problem to determine whether (4) holds in any range of q. A lower bound of the conjectured order of magnitude was obtained by Friedlander and Goldston [FG1], who showed that in the range $x/(\log x)^A \leq q \leq x$,

$$V(x;q) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)\right) x\log q.$$

Hooley [H6] improved the range of validity of this bound to $\exp(-C\sqrt{\log x}) < q \leq x$.

Similar bounds are known in a wider range of q under GRH [FG1, FG2, H6]; the most precise lower bound appearing in the literature is

$$V(x;q) \geq \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{\alpha} - o(1)\right) x\log q \qquad (5)$$

in the range $x^{\frac{2}{3}+\epsilon} \leq q \leq x$, where $\alpha = \log q/\log x$. As for upper bounds, Turan [Tu] has shown under GRH that $V(x;q) \ll x(\log x)^4$. Friedlander and Goldston [FG1] have shown that if in addition to GRH one assumes a strong version of the Hardy-Littlewood Conjecture on prime pairs, then (4) holds in the range $x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \leq q \leq x$. More precisely, they show that if we assume the (ordinary) Riemann Hypothesis and we assume for fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and in the range $0 < |k| \leq x$ that

$$\sum_{\max(0,-k)<n\leq\min(x,x-k)} \Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+k) = \mathfrak{S}(k)(x-|k|) + O(x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}),$$

where the singular series for prime pairs is defined by

$$\mathfrak{S}(k) := \begin{cases} 2\prod_{p\neq 2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{(p-1)^2}\right)\prod_{\substack{p\mid k\\ p\neq 2}}\left(\frac{p-1}{p-2}\right) & \text{if } k\neq 0 \text{ is even,} \\ 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd,}\end{cases} \qquad (6)$$

then we have for $x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \leq q \leq x^{1-\epsilon}$ the estimate

$$\frac{V(x;q)}{x} = \log q - \left(\gamma + \log(2\pi) + \sum_{p\mid q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}\right) + O(x^{-\delta(\epsilon)}). \qquad (7)$$

In the range $x^{1-\epsilon} \leq q \leq x$, their estimate takes the form $V(x;q)/x = \log q + O((\log\log q)^3)$. Finally, Vaughan [V] established upper bounds on the general k-th moment of the error term in (7) for $Q/2 < q \leq Q$ in the range $x(\log x)^{-A} \leq Q \leq x$ (unconditionally) and $x^{\frac{3}{4}+\epsilon} \leq Q \leq x$ (under GRH).

We wish to emphasize that (3) gives an asymptotic result for Q in the range $x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \leq Q \leq x$, and that *no asymptotic results are known in the range* $Q \leq x^{\frac{1}{2}}$, even conditionally. Moreover, (5) gives the correct order of magnitude of $V(x;q)$, provided $x^{\frac{2}{3}+\epsilon} \leq q \leq x$. Even under a strong version of the Hardy-Littlewood Conjecture, the best known range of validity of (4) is $x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \leq q \leq x$. Therefore, the behaviour of $V(x;q)$ for $q \leq x^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a mystery and it is not clear whether an asymptotic formula such as (4) should hold in this range. As Friedlander and Goldston [FG1] put it,

> It may well be that these also hold for smaller q, but below $q = x^{\frac{1}{2}}$ we are somewhat skeptical.

In a recent paper, Keating and Rudnick [KR] (see also [K1, K2]) established a function field analogue of Hooley's conjecture which suggests that (4) might hold in the extended range $x^{\epsilon} \leq q \leq x$, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$.

In the current paper we establish a probabilistic result which suggests that (4) should hold all the way down to $q = (\log\log x)^{1+\delta}$, and should not hold in the range $q \leq (\log\log x)^{1-\delta}$.

Conjecture 1.1. *Fix $\delta > 0$. In the range $(\log\log x)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq x$ we have*

$$V(x;q) \sim x\log q.$$

To justify this conjecture, we will show in Proposition 1.7 that under GRH and a Linear Independence Hypothesis, the limiting logarithmic distribution of $\phi(q)V(x;q)/x$ coincides with the distribution of an explicit random variable H_q (see Definition 2.1).

1.1. Analysis of the random variable H_q under GRH.

We analyze the random variable H_q defined in (9), by first computing its mean and variance.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume GRH. Then the random variable H_q defined in (9) satisfies*

$$\mathtt{E}[H_q] = \phi(q)\log q\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log\log q}{\log q}\right)\right), \quad Var[H_q] = 2\phi(q)(\log q)^2\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log\log q}{\log q}\right)\right).$$

If we moreover assume that $L(\frac{1}{2},\chi) \neq 0$ (this is Chowla's Conjecture), then we have a more precise estimate for the mean:

$$\mathtt{E}[H_q] = \phi(q)\left(\log q - \gamma - \log(2\pi) - \sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1} + O\left(\frac{(\log q)^2}{q}\right)\right).$$

Hence, H_q is a random variable which is concentrated about its mean $\mathtt{E}[H_q] \sim \phi(q)\log q$. In light of Proposition 1.7, this gives an intuitive reason why (4) should hold. Our main result is an estimate on the large deviations of H_q, which gives information on the range of validity of (4).

Theorem 1.3. *Assume GRH, and let H_q be the random variable defined in (9). If q is large enough and $(\log\log q)^2/\log q \leq \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ (ϵ can depend on q), then we have the following bounds on the large deviations of H_q:*

$$\frac{1}{4}\exp(-c_1\epsilon^2\phi(q)) \leq Prob[|H_q - \phi(q)\log q| > \epsilon\phi(q)\log q] \leq 2\exp(-c_2\epsilon^2\phi(q)), \qquad (8)$$

where ϵ_0, c_1 and c_2 are absolute constants.

Remark 1.4. If in addition to GRH we assume that $L(\frac{1}{2},\chi) \neq 0$ and we replace $H_q - \phi(q)\log q$ with $H_q - \phi(q)\big(\log q - \gamma - \log(2\pi) - \sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}\big)$ in (8), then we can extend the range of ϵ to $\Psi(q)\log q/q \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, where $\Psi(q)$ is any function tending to infinity with q and ϵ_0 is an absolute constant.

Remark 1.5. What Theorem 1.3 roughly says is that the large deviations of H_q are those of a normal distribution of mean $\mathbb{E}[H_q] \approx \phi(q)\log q$ and variance $\mathrm{Var}[H_q] \approx 2\phi(q)(\log q)^2$ (see Theorem 1.2). Indeed, such a distribution $Z_q \sim N(\phi(q)\log q, 2\phi(q)(\log q)^2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Prob}[|Z_q - \phi(q)\log q| > \epsilon\phi(q)\log q] &= \mathrm{Prob}\left[\frac{|Z_q - \mathbb{E}[Z_q]|}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}[Z_q]}} > \epsilon\sqrt{\phi(q)/2}\right] \\ &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\epsilon\sqrt{\phi(q)/2}}^{\infty} e^{-t^2/2}dt \sim \frac{2}{\epsilon\sqrt{\pi\phi(q)}}\exp(-\epsilon^2\phi(q)/4).\end{aligned}$$

1.2. **Relation between $V(x;q)$ and H_q.** Assuming the following linear independence hypothesis and GRH, we will show that the distribution of H_q coincides with the limiting logarithmic distribution of $\phi(q)V(x;q)/x$.

Hypothesis LI (Linear Independence)**.** *For any $q \geq 1$, the multiset $Z(q) := \{\Im(\rho) \geq 0 : L(\rho,\chi) = 0, \chi \bmod q, \Re(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$, that is the set of all non-negative imaginary parts of zeros of $L(s,\chi)$ with $\chi \bmod q$ and $\Re(s) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Hypothesis LI first appeared for $\zeta(s)$ in the work of Wintner [W] on the distribution of $x^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\psi(x) - x)$, and has subsequently been used by many authors for similar purposes [H5, Mo2, Mn]. It is now a standard hypothesis in the study of prime number races [RS, FeMa, Ma, N1, FiMa, La1, La2, La3, Fi1, Fi2]. Partial results towards LI include the work of Martin and Ng in the case of Dirichlet L-functions [MaN] and the work of Kowalski in the context of hyperelliptic curves over finite fields [Ko].

Remark 1.6. Hypothesis LI implies that all nontrivial zeros of $L(s,\chi)$ are simple and do not lie on the real line.

Proposition 1.7. *Assume GRH and LI. Then as $x \to \infty$, the limiting logarithmic distribution of $\phi(q)V(x;q)/x$ coincides with that of the random variable H_q.*

Going back to Theorem 1.3, we see that under GRH and LI, the probability that $V(e^y;q) \not\sim e^y\log q$, that is the probability that for a fixed $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ we have $|H_q - \phi(q)\log q| > \epsilon\phi(q)\log q$, is at most $2\exp(-c_2\epsilon^2\phi(q))$. Hence we expect that this event does not happen at all in the range $y = o(\exp(c_2\epsilon^2\phi(q)))$; this translates to the statement that $V(x;q) \sim x\log q$ in the range $(\log\log x)^{1+\delta} < q \leq x^{o(1)}$, justifying Conjecture 1.1. We will expand this argument in the concluding remarks.

Remark 1.8. It is interesting to note that the secondary term $-\gamma - \log(2\pi) - \sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}$ appearing in Theorem 1.2 is identical to the secondary term appearing in (7). Indeed, these terms come from quite different sources. The one appearing in the current paper comes from the following GRH estimate, with the γ_χ running through the imaginary parts of the non-trivial zeros of $L(s,\chi)$:

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}}\sum_{\gamma_\chi}\frac{1}{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma^2} = \phi(q)\left(\log q - \gamma - \log(2\pi) - \sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1} + O\left(\frac{(\log q)^2}{q}\right)\right),$$

whereas the one in [FG1] comes from their Proposition 3, which is an estimate for the average of the Hardy-Littlewood singular series for prime pairs defined in (6). Their estimate takes the form

$$\sum_{j\leq y}\mathfrak{S}(jq)\left(1-\frac{j}{y}\right)=\frac{y}{2}\frac{q}{\phi(q)}-\frac{\log y}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\bigg(\gamma+\log(2\pi)-1+\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}\bigg)+J_\delta(y,q),$$

where $J_\delta(y,q)$ is an error term.

1.3. **Method of proof and possible extensions.** The proof of Theorem 1.3 is based on the analytic properties of the moment-generating function (Laplace transform) of H_q. Previous estimates on large deviations of error terms of prime counting functions [Mo2, Mn, MoOd, RS, N1, N2, La2] are based on an explicit formula for the moment-generating function of the associated random variable which involves infinite products of Bessel functions. For example, under GRH and LI, the moment-generating function of the distribution of the error term $e^{-y/2}(Li(e^y)-\pi(e^y))$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(z)=e^z\prod_{\gamma>0}I_0\bigg(\frac{2z}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma^2}}\bigg),$$

where I_0 is the modified Bessel function and γ runs through the imaginary parts of the nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$. We could not use this approach in our analysis since such a nice closed form is not known for the moment-generating function of H_q. Instead we use that

$$H_q=\sum_{\chi\in C(q)}|Y_\chi|^2,$$

where $C(q)$ is a certain set of characters $\bmod q$ and the Y_χ are independent random variables whose real and imaginary parts have moment-generating functions which are known explicitly (see Lemma 3.4). From this we compute the moments of H_q in terms of the moments of $|Y_\chi|^2$, which we then bound using complex analysis. The moment-generating functions of $\Re(Y_\chi)$ and $\Im(Y_\chi)$ are entire; this is a consequence of the fact that the n-th moments of $\Re(Y_\chi)$ and $\Im(Y_\chi)$ are bounded above by $n!^{\frac{1}{2}+O_q(1/\log n)}$. From this we obtain a bound for the n-th moment of $|Y_\chi|^2$ of order $n!^{1+O_q(1/\log n)}$, which we believe is best possible (such is the case with the Gaussian). Hence we deduce the existence of the moment-generating function of H_q inside the circle $|z|=(c\log q)^{-1}$. Using this information we give bounds on large deviations of H_q by using a method similar to that used to prove the Bernstein Inequalities.

Remark 1.9. It is possible to say something about the limiting logarithmic distribution of $\phi(q)V(x;q)/x$ without the assumption LI. Indeed, one can adapt the techniques used in Section 2 of [Fi2] to show that this distribution has mean

$$\phi(q)\bigg(\log q-\gamma-\log(2\pi)-\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}+O\left(\frac{(\log q)^2}{q}\right)\bigg),$$

under GRH and the assumption that the nontrivial zeros of

$$Z_q(s):=\prod_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}}L(s,\chi)$$

are simple and nonreal. This is based on the fact that the calculation of the mean in the proof of Theorem 1.2 depends only on the fact that the Z_{γ_χ} have zero covariance.

Remark 1.10. One could ask if the methods of the current paper generalize to the study of the m-th moment

$$H^{(m)}(x;q) := \sum_{\substack{a \bmod q \\ (a,q)=1}} \left(\psi(x;q,a) - \frac{\psi(x,\chi_0)}{\phi(q)} \right)^m .$$

The first problem of our approach to this problem for $m \geq 3$ is the lack of a nice formula such as (11), and hence it seems hard to turn this question into a question about sums of independent random variables. Another serious problem is that the method of moments would fail for $m = 3$. Indeed the formula analogous to (11) for $m = 3$ contains terms of the form $\psi(x,\chi)^3$ with cubic characters χ, and the moments of these terms grow too fast for the moment method to be applied. This is analogous to the fact that if Z is a standard Gaussian, then the distribution of Z^3 is indeterminate. Indeed, Berg [Be] has given an explicit infinite family of distinct random variables whose moments coincide with those of Z^3. Specifically, if $|r| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ is any real number, then the random variable whose probability density is

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{3\sqrt{\pi}} |t|^{-\frac{2}{3}} e^{-|t|^{\frac{2}{3}}} \left(1 + r\cos(\sqrt{3}|t|^{\frac{2}{3}}) - \sqrt{3}\sin(\sqrt{3}|t|^{\frac{2}{3}}) \right)$$

has exactly the same moments as Z^3.

2. Link with random variables

We now relate the study of $V(x;q)$ to that of the random variable H_q. As we will use orthogonality relations, it will be useful to treat real and complex characters seperately. Throughout the paper, $C(q)$ will denote a fixed subset of the Dirichlet characters modulo q such that $C(q)$ contains each non-principal real character, and contains exactly one of χ or $\overline{\chi}$ for complex characters χ.

Definition 2.1. *We define the random variables $Z_{\chi;\gamma_\chi} = Z_{\gamma_\chi}$ to be i.i.d. random variables uniformly distributed on the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$, where χ runs over the set $C(q)$ and γ_χ runs over the imaginary parts of the nontrivial zeros of $L(s,\chi)$ (in the case χ is real, only positive imaginary parts will be considered). We also define*

$$H_q := \sum_{\chi \in C(q)} |Y_\chi|^2, \tag{9}$$

where

$$Y_\chi := \begin{cases} 2\sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \frac{\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2}} & \textit{if } \chi \textit{ is real,} \\ \sqrt{2}\sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq 0} \frac{Z_{\gamma_\chi}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2}} & \textit{if } \chi \textit{ is complex.} \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Remark 2.2. It might be preferable to use the notation $Z_{\chi;\gamma_\chi}$ rather than Z_{γ_χ}, since in the way we define these random variables we stipulate that if $\chi \neq \chi'$, then Z_{χ,γ_χ} and $Z_{\chi',\gamma_{\chi'}}$ are independent, whatever γ_χ and $\gamma_{\chi'}$ are. We will keep the notation Z_{γ_χ} to be more concise.

Remark 2.3. The collection $\{|Y_\chi|^2 : \chi \in C(q)\}$ is independent. This fact will be useful when computing the moments of H_q.

Proof of Proposition 1.7. Using orthogonality relations, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} V(x;q) &= \sum_{\substack{a \bmod q \\ (a,q)=1}} \left| \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \overline{\chi}(a)\psi(x,\chi) \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\phi(q)^2} \sum_{\substack{\chi_1,\chi_2 \bmod q \\ \chi_1,\chi_2 \neq \chi_0}} \psi(x,\chi_1)\psi(x,\overline{\chi_2}) \sum_{\substack{a \bmod q \\ (a,q)=1}} \overline{\chi_1}(a)\chi_2(a) \qquad (11) \\ &= \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} |\psi(x,\chi)|^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Applying GRH to the explicit formula, we obtain that

$$V(x;q) = \frac{x}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi \log x}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 + O(\sqrt{x}(\log x)^3),$$

so

$$\phi(q)e^{-y}V(e^y;q) = \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 + O(\phi(q)e^{-\frac{y}{2}}y^3). \qquad (12)$$

Using the fact that $\overline{L(s,\chi)} = L(\overline{s},\overline{\chi})$ and that real nontrivial zeros do not exist under LI, we transform the sum over zeros as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \neq \chi_0 \\ \chi \text{ real}}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \left(\frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} + \frac{e^{-i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} - i\gamma_\chi} \right) \right|^2 + \sum_{\substack{\chi \in C(q) \\ \chi \text{ complex}}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq 0} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\chi \in C(q) \\ \chi \text{ complex}}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_{\overline{\chi}} \neq 0} \frac{e^{i\gamma_{\overline{\chi}} y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_{\overline{\chi}}} \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0 \\ \chi \text{ real}}} \left| 2\Re \sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 + \sum_{\substack{\chi \in C(q) \\ \chi \text{ complex}}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq 0} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 + \sum_{\substack{\chi \in C(q) \\ \chi \text{ complex}}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq 0} \frac{e^{-i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} - i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 \\ &= 4 \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0 \\ \chi \text{ real}}} \left(\sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \Re \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{\substack{\chi \in C(q) \\ \chi \text{ complex}}} \left| \sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq 0} \frac{e^{i\gamma_\chi y}}{\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi} \right|^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Now, $|\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_\chi| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \gamma_\chi^2}$, and under LI[2], if we order the γ_χ appearing in the above sums by size, then for every fixed k the vector $(e^{i\gamma_1 y}, ..., e^{i\gamma_k y}) \subset \mathbb{T}^k$ becomes equidistributed as $y \to \infty$ by the Kronecker-Weyl Theorem. The assertion follows similarly as in Section 2 of [RS] or Proposition 2.3 of [FiMa].

---

[2] Note that if χ is complex, then LI implies that the set of imaginary parts of nontrivial zeros of $L(s,\chi)$ is linearly independent. This follows from the fact that the zeros of positive imaginary part of both $L(s,\chi)$ and $L(s,\overline{\chi})$ appear in the set $Z(q)$ in the statement of LI.

$\square$

3. The first two moments of H_q

In order to prove Theorem 1.2 we need several lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume GRH and let* $\chi \neq \chi_0$ *be a character* $\bmod q$*. Then, letting* γ_χ *run over the imaginary parts of the nontrivial zeros of* $L(s,\chi)$ *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2} &= \log \frac{q^*}{\pi} - \gamma - (1+\chi(-1))\log 2 + 2\Re \frac{L'(1,\chi^*)}{L(1,\chi^*)} \\ &= \log q^* + O(\log\log q^*).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first equality is Lemma 3.5 of [FiMa]. The second follows from applying Littlewood's GRH bound $L'(1,\chi)/L(1,\chi) \ll \log\log q^*$ (see [Li]) to the first. $\square$

We will need a bound for the average of $2\Re(L'(1,\chi^*)/L(1,\chi^*))$ over $\chi \neq \chi_0$.

Lemma 3.2. *Under GRH, the following holds:*

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \frac{L'(1,\chi^*)}{L(1,\chi^*)} \ll \phi(q)\frac{(\log q)^2}{q}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \frac{L'(1,\chi^*)}{L(1,\chi^*)} = \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \sum_n \frac{\chi^*(n)\Lambda(n)}{n} = \sum_n \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \chi^*(n). \tag{13}$$

Now, taking $r=1$ in Proposition 3.4 of [FiMa] shows that for $e \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{\chi \bmod q} (\chi^*(p^e) - \chi(p^e)) = \begin{cases} \phi(q/p^\nu) & \text{if } p^\nu \parallel q, \nu \geq 1 \text{ and } p^e \equiv 1 \bmod q/p^\nu, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Therefore, denoting by $e(q;p)$ the least $e \geq 1$ such that $p^e \equiv 1 \bmod q/p^\nu$ (note that $p^{e(q;p)} \geq q/p^\nu$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_n \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} (\chi^*(n)-\chi(n)) &= \sum_{\substack{p^\nu \parallel q\\ p^e\equiv 1 \bmod q/p^\nu\\ \nu,e\geq 1}} \frac{\log p}{p^e}\phi(q/p^\nu) = \sum_{\substack{p^\nu\parallel q\\ \nu\geq 1}} \phi(q/p^\nu)\log p \sum_{\substack{e\geq 1\\ p^e\equiv 1 \bmod q/p^\nu}} \frac{1}{p^e} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{p^\nu\parallel q\\ \nu\geq 1}} \phi(q/p^\nu)\log p \frac{1}{p^{e(q;p)}(1-p^{-e(q;p)})} \ll \sum_{\substack{p^\nu\parallel q\\ \nu\geq 1}} \frac{\phi(q/p^\nu)\log p}{p^{e(q;p)}} \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{p^\nu\parallel q\\ \nu\geq 1}} \frac{\phi(q/p^\nu)\log p}{q/p^\nu} \ll \log q.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{n} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n}(\chi_0^*(n)-\chi_0(n)) = \sum_{\substack{p^\nu \| q \\ \nu\geq 1}} \log p \sum_{1\leq e\leq \nu} \frac{1}{p^e} \ll \sum_{p|q} \frac{\log p}{p} \ll \log\log q.$$

Hence, (13) becomes

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \frac{L'(1,\chi^*)}{L(1,\chi^*)} = \sum_{n} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \chi(n) + O(\log q) = \left(\phi(q) \sum_{n\equiv 1 \bmod q} - \sum_{n}\right) \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} + O(\log q),$$

where term on the right hand side should be interpreted as the limit of the truncated sums. We first treat the values of n for which $n > q^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\phi(q) \sum_{\substack{n\equiv 1 \bmod q \\ n>q^2}} - \sum_{n>q^2}\right) \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} &= \int_{q^2}^{\infty} \frac{d(\phi(q)\psi(t;q,1)-\psi(t))}{t} \\ &= \frac{\phi(q)\psi(t;q,1)-\psi(t)}{t}\bigg|_{q^2}^{\infty} + \int_{q^2}^{\infty} \frac{\phi(q)\psi(t;q,1)-\psi(t)}{t^2} dt \\ &\ll \phi(q)(q^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\log q)^2 + \phi(q)\int_{q^2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log(t^2))^2}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt \ll \phi(q)\frac{(\log q)^2}{q},\end{aligned}$$

by GRH. As for the values $n \leq q^2$, we have the following elementary estimates:

$$\phi(q) \sum_{\substack{n\equiv 1 \bmod q \\ n\leq q^2}} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \leq 2\phi(q)\log q \sum_{1\leq j\leq q} \frac{1}{qj+1} \ll \phi(q)\frac{(\log q)^2}{q},$$

$$\sum_{n\leq q^2} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \ll \log q.$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \frac{L'(1,\chi^*)}{L(1,\chi^*)} \ll \log q + \phi(q)\frac{(\log q)^2}{q},$$

and the result follows from the bound $\phi(q) \gg q/\log\log q$. □

Lemma 3.3. *For any* $q \geq 3$,

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \log q^* = \phi(q)\left(\log q - \sum_{p|q} \frac{\log p}{p-1}\right) = \phi(q)\left(\log q + O(\log\log q)\right), \tag{14}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} (\log q^*)^2 = \phi(q)(\log q)^2 \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log\log q}{\log q}\right)\right).$$

Proof. The first statement is Proposition 3.3 of [FiMa]. As for the second, we adapt Proposition 3.3 of [FiMa]. The arithmetical function $\Lambda_2(n) := \sum_{d|n} (\log d)^2 \mu(n/d)$ is supported on integers having at most two prime factors, and takes the following values:

$$\Lambda_2(p^e) = (2e-1)(\log p)^2, \qquad \Lambda_2(p_1^{e_1} p_2^{e_2}) = 2 \log p_1 \log p_2. \tag{15}$$

Following (3.2) of [FiMa], we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d|q} \phi(d) \Lambda_2(q/d) &= \sum_{d|q} \Big(\sum_{\chi \bmod d} 1 \Big) \Lambda_2(q/d) \\ &= \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\substack{d|q \\ q^*|d}} \Lambda_2(q/d) \\ &= \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\ell | q/q^*} \Lambda_2(\ell) \\ &= \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \big(\log \frac{q}{q^*}\big)^2 \\ &= \phi(q)(\log q)^2 - 2 \log q \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \log q^* + \sum_{\chi \bmod q} (\log q^*)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (14) shows that

$$\sum_{\chi \bmod q} (\log q^*)^2 = \phi(q)(\log q)^2 + O\Big(\phi(q) \log q \log\log q + \sum_{d|q} \phi(d) \Lambda_2(q/d) \Big),$$

and so the last step is to show that $\sum_{d|q} \phi(d) \Lambda_2(q/d) \ll \phi(q) \log q \log\log q$. Arguing as in Lemma 3.2 of [FiMa] and using (15) we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d|q}\phi(d)\Lambda_2(q/d) &= \sum_{p^r\|q}\sum_{k=0}^{r-1}\Lambda_2(p^{r-k})\phi(q/p^{r-k})\\ &\quad+\sum_{\substack{p_1^{r_1}\|q,p_2^{r_2}\|q\\ p_1<p_2}}\ \sum_{\substack{0\le k_1\le r_1-1\\ 0\le k_2\le r_2-1}}\Lambda_2(p_1^{r_1-k_1}p_2^{r_2-k_2})\phi(q/(p_1^{r_1-k_1}p_2^{r_2-k_2}))\\ &=\sum_{p^r\|q}\phi(q/p^r)\sum_{k=0}^{r-1}(2r-2k-1)(\log p)^2\phi(p^k)\\ &\quad+2\sum_{\substack{p_1^{r_1}\|q,p_2^{r_2}\|q\\ p_1<p_2}}\phi(q/(p_1^{r_1}p_2^{r_2}))\sum_{\substack{0\le k_1\le r_1-1\\ 0\le k_2\le r_2-1}}\log p_1\log p_2\phi(p_1^{k_1})\phi(p_2^{k_2})\\ &=\sum_{p^r\|q}\phi(q/p^r)(\log p)^2\left[\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)\frac{p^{r+1}+p^r-p(2r+1)+2r-1}{(p-1)^2}+\frac{2r-1}{p}\right]\\ &\quad+2\sum_{\substack{p_1^{r_1}\|q,p_2^{r_2}\|q\\ p_1<p_2}}\phi(q/(p_1^{r_1}p_2^{r_2}))\log p_1\log p_2 p_1^{r_1-1}p_2^{r_2-1}\\ &\ll\sum_{p^r\|q}\phi(q/p^r)(\log p)^2\left(p^{r-1}+\frac{r}{p^2}\right)+\phi(q)\left(\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p}\right)^2\ll\phi(q)\log q,\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof.

□

For a real-valued random variable W, we will use the following notation for its moment-generating function:

$$\mathcal{L}_W(z):=\mathbb{E}[e^{zW}].$$

Lemma 3.4. *Assume GRH and define Y_χ as in (10). Then for real characters χ, the moment-generating function of Y_χ is an even function of z given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_{Y_\chi}(z):=\prod_{\gamma_\chi>0}I_0\left(\frac{2z}{\sqrt{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2}}\right),\tag{16}$$

where γ_χ runs over the imaginary parts of the nontrivial zeros of $L(s,\chi)$ and I_0 is the modified Bessel of the first kind:

$$I_0(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!^2}\left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^{2n}.$$

If χ is complex, then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Re(Y_\chi)}(z)=\mathcal{L}_{\Im(Y_\chi)}(z)=\prod_{\gamma_\chi\neq0}I_0\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}z}{\sqrt{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2}}\right).\tag{17}$$

Proof. First note that the Z_{γ_χ} appearing in (10) are independent, and thus if χ is real, then

$$\mathtt{E}[e^{zY_\chi}] = \prod_{\gamma_\chi>0} \mathtt{E}[e^{2(\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2)^{-\frac12} z\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})}] = \prod_{\gamma_\chi>0} \mathcal{L}_{\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})}\left(\frac{2z}{\sqrt{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2}}\right).$$

The proof of (16) follows since the moment-generating function of $\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})$ is easily computed using the following integral representation of the Bessel I_0 function:

$$I_0(z) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\pi e^{z\cos\theta} d\theta.$$

(See Proposition 2.13 of [FiMa] for a similar derivation of the characteristic function of Y_χ.) The proof of (17) is similar. ☐

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We start with the mean, which by (9) equals

$$\mathtt{E}[H_q] = \sum_{\chi\in C(q)} \mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2] = \sum_{\chi\in C(q)} \mathtt{E}[\Re(Y_\chi)^2 + \Im(Y_\chi)^2] = \sum_{\chi\in C(q)} (\mathrm{Var}[\Re(Y_\chi)] + \mathrm{Var}[\Im(Y_\chi)]), \quad (18)$$

since we easily get from (10) that $\mathtt{E}[\Re(Y_\chi)] = \mathtt{E}[\Im(Y_\chi)] = 0$. Moreover, since the random variables Z_{γ_χ} appearing in (10) are independent and since one easily computes that $\mathrm{Var}[\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})] = \frac12$, we have for real χ that

$$\mathrm{Var}[Y_\chi] = 4\sum_{\gamma_\chi>0} \frac{\mathrm{Var}[\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})]}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} = \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{1}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} - 4m_\chi, \quad (19)$$

where m_χ is the order of vanishing of $L(s,\chi)$ at $s=\frac12$. As for complex χ, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}[\Re(Y_\chi)] = \mathrm{Var}[\Im(Y_\chi)] = 2\sum_{\gamma_\chi\neq 0} \frac{\mathrm{Var}[\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})]}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} = \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{1}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} - 4m_\chi. \quad (20)$$

Hence, combining (18), (19) and (20),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathtt{E}[H_q] &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0\\ \chi \text{ real}}} \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{1}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} - 4\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0\\ \chi \text{ real}}} m_\chi + 2\sum_{\substack{\chi\in C(q)\\ \chi \text{ complex}}} \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{1}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} - 8\sum_{\substack{\chi\in C(q)\\ \chi \text{ complex}}} m_\chi \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \sum_{\gamma_\chi} \frac{1}{\frac14+\gamma_\chi^2} - 4\sum_{\chi\neq\chi_0} m_\chi, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

by definition of $C(q)$ and by the fact that $\overline{L(s,\chi)} = L(\overline{s},\overline{\chi})$. Taking

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} 1-|x| & \text{if } |x|\leq 1\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$$

in Theorem 1.3 of [FiMi] (This also follows from Theorem 1.4 of [GJMMNPP]) shows that

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} m_\chi \ll \phi(q). \quad (22)$$

(Since we are assuming GRH, the sum of the multiplicities at the central point is bounded by the 1-level density of low-lying zeros.) The first estimate for $\mathbb{E}[H_q]$ follows from combining (21) with Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3. As for the second (note that we are now assuming Chowla's Conjecture, so $m_\chi = 0$), we combine (21) with the exact formula in Lemma 3.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[H_q] &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \left(\log \frac{q^*}{\pi} - \gamma - (1+\chi(-1))\log 2 + 2\Re \frac{L'(1,\chi^*)}{L(1,\chi^*)} \right) \\ &= \phi(q)\left(\log q - \gamma - \log(2\pi) - \sum_{p|q} \frac{\log p}{p-1} \right) + O(1) + 2\Re \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \frac{L'(1,\chi)}{L(1,\chi)},\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.3. The desired estimate follows by applying Lemma 3.2.

As for $\mathrm{Var}[H_q]$, we have by (9) and by the independence of the $|Y_\chi|^2$ that

$$\mathrm{Var}[H_q] = \sum_{\chi \in C(q)} \mathrm{Var}[|Y_\chi|^2] = \sum_{\chi \in C(q)} (\mathbb{E}[|Y_\chi|^4] - \mathbb{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]^2). \tag{23}$$

If χ is real, then the moments of Y_χ can be extracted from its moment-generating function which we obtained in Lemma 3.4 (note that this function is even):

$$1 + \frac{z^2}{2!}\mathbb{E}[Y_\chi^2] + \frac{z^4}{4!}\mathbb{E}[Y_\chi^4] + \cdots = \prod_{\gamma_\chi > 0} I_0\left(\frac{2z}{\sqrt{\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2}} \right) = \prod_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \left(1 + \frac{z^2}{\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2} + \frac{z^4}{4\left(\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2\right)^2} + \dots \right),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Y_\chi^4] &= 4!\left(\sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \frac{1}{4\left(\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2\right)^2} + \sum_{\gamma_\chi > \lambda_\chi > 0} \frac{1}{(\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2)(\frac14 + \lambda_\chi^2)} \right) \\ &= 4!\left(\frac12 \left(\sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \frac{1}{\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2} \right)^2 - \frac34 \sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \frac{1}{\left(\frac14 + \gamma_\chi^2\right)^2} \right) \\ &= 3(\log q^*)^2 + O(\log q^* \log\log q^*) + O(m_\chi^2),\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

by Lemma 3.1 and the Riemann-von Mangoldt Formula.

As for complex characters χ, we have by the definition of Y_χ that summing over the zeros of $L(s,\chi)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_\chi|^4] = 4 \sum_{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3,\gamma_4 \neq 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_{\gamma_1} Z_{\gamma_2} \overline{Z_{\gamma_3} Z_{\gamma_4}}]}{(\frac12 + \gamma_1^2)^{\frac12}(\frac12 + \gamma_2^2)^{\frac12}(\frac12 + \gamma_3^2)^{\frac12}(\frac12 + \gamma_4^2)^{\frac12}}.$$

Moreover, by independence of the Z_γ and since $\mathbb{E}[Z_\gamma] = 0$ and $|Z_\gamma| = 1$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_{\gamma_1} Z_{\gamma_2} \overline{Z_{\gamma_3} Z_{\gamma_4}}] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = \gamma_4, \\ 0 & \text{if exactly three of the } \gamma_i \text{ are equal}, \\ 1 & \text{if } \gamma_1 = \gamma_3 \neq \gamma_2 = \gamma_4 \text{ or } \gamma_1 = \gamma_4 \neq \gamma_2 = \gamma_3, \\ 0 & \text{if } \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 \neq \gamma_3 = \gamma_4, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^4] = 4\sum_{\gamma_1\neq 0}\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2}+\gamma_1^2)^2} + 8\sum_{\substack{\gamma_1,\gamma_2\neq 0\\ \gamma_1\neq\gamma_2}}\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2}+\gamma_1^2)(\frac{1}{2}+\gamma_2^2)} = 8(\log q^*)^2 + O(m_\chi^2+\log q^*) \tag{25}$$

by Lemma 3.1 and the Riemann-von Mangoldt Formula. Combining this with (23) and the previous calculation of $\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]$ in (18) and (20) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}[H_q] &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0\\ \chi \text{ real}}} (3(\log q^*)^2 - (\log q^*)^2 + O(m_\chi^2 + \log q^* \log\log q^*))\\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\chi\in C(q)\\ \chi \text{ complex}}} (8(\log q^*)^2 - 4(\log q^*)^2 + O(m_\chi^2 + \log q^*\log\log q^*))\\ &= \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} 2(\log q^*)^2 + O(\phi(q)\log q\log\log q),\end{aligned}$$

since

$$\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} m_\chi^2 \leq (\max_\chi m_\chi)\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} m_\chi \ll \log q\cdot\phi(q)$$

by the Riemann von-Mangoldt Formula and (22). The result follows from Lemma 3.3. ☐

4. LARGE DEVIATIONS OF H_q

One would like to apply the existing results on large deviations such as the Montgomery-Odlyzko bounds [MoOd] to our question. Expanding the square in (9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}H_q = 4 &\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0\\ \chi\text{ real}}}\sum_{\gamma_\chi>0}\frac{\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})^2}{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2} + 8\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0\\ \chi\text{ real}}}\sum_{\gamma_\chi>\lambda_\chi>0}\frac{\Re(Z_{\gamma_\chi})\Re(Z_{\lambda_\chi})}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\lambda_\chi^2}}\\ &+ 2\sum_{\substack{\chi\in C(q)\\ \chi\text{ complex}}}\sum_{\gamma_\chi\neq 0}\frac{|Z_{\gamma_\chi}|^2}{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2} + 4\sum_{\substack{\chi\in C(q)\\ \chi\text{ complex}}}\sum_{\substack{\gamma_\chi,\lambda_\chi\neq 0\\ \gamma_\chi>\lambda_\chi}}\frac{Z_{\gamma_\chi}\overline{Z_{\lambda_\chi}}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\gamma_\chi^2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}+\lambda_\chi^2}}.\end{aligned}$$

At this point we run into the problem that the random variables in this expression are not all mutually independent, hence this sum of random variables does not satisfy the hypotheses of classical theorems on large deviations. We will use an alternative approach based on bounds on the moment-generating function (Laplace transform) of H_q, which we will then transfer into bounds on large deviations of H_q.

While the moment-generating functions of $\Re(Y_\chi)$ and $\Im(Y_\chi)$ can be computed explicitly in terms of Bessel functions (see Lemma 3.4), we were not able to find such a nice closed formula for H_q. We begin this section with an effective Stirling Formula.

Lemma 4.1 (Stirling's Formula). *We have for $n\geq 2$ that*

$$2.506... = \sqrt{2\pi} < \frac{n!}{\sqrt{n}(n/e)^n} < \sqrt{2\pi}e^{\frac{1}{24}} = 2.613...$$

Proof. See 6.1.42 of [AS]. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Assume GRH and let* Y_χ *be the random variable defined in* (10). *We have for* q^* *large enough and for* $n \geq 1$ *that*

$$\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n}] \leq 5.7 n^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{4n \log q^*}{e - o(1)} \right)^n .$$

Proof. We will use the explicit formula for the moment-generating functions of $\Re(Y_\chi)$ and $\Im(Y_\chi)$ appearing in Lemma 3.4. Note that $I_0(z)$ is an entire function of z, and so the absolutely convergent product (16) is also an entire function. The Taylor series of $I_0(z)$ gives the following immediate bound:

$$|I_0(z)| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!^2} \left(\frac{|z|}{2} \right)^{2n} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{|z|^2}{4} \right)^n = e^{|z|^2/4}.$$

For real characters χ, this gives a bound on $\mathcal{L}_{Y_\chi}(z)$, since by (16),

$$|\mathcal{L}_{Y_\chi}(z)| \leq \exp\left(\sum_{\gamma_\chi > 0} \frac{|z|^2}{\frac{1}{4} + \gamma_\chi^2} \right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{|z|^2}{2} (\log q^* + O(\log\log q^*)) \right)$$

for q^* large enough, by Lemma 3.1. We now use this to bound the moments of Y_χ. Cauchy's formula for the derivatives reads

$$\mathrm{E}[Y_\chi^{2n}] = \frac{(2n)!}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=C} \mathcal{L}_{Y_\chi}(z) \frac{dz}{z^{2n+1}},$$

and so by our bound on $\mathcal{L}_{Y_\chi}(z)$,

$$|\mathrm{E}[Y_\chi^{2n}]| \leq (2n)! \exp\left(\frac{C^2 \log q^*}{2 - o(1)} \right) C^{-2n}.$$

Taking $n \geq 1$ and $C = (2n/\log q^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{E}[Y_\chi^{2n}] \leq (2n)! \left(\frac{2n(1 + o(1))}{e \log q^*} \right)^{-n},$$

which by applying Lemma 4.1 gives the bound

$$\mathrm{E}[Y_\chi^{2n}] \leq 3.7 n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2n \log q^*}{e - o(1)} \right)^n .$$

If χ is complex, then we apply the above argument to the moment-generating function of $\Re(Y_\chi)$ and $\Im(Y_\chi)$ (see (17)). Doing so, we obtain the following bound:

$$\mathrm{E}[\Re(Y_\chi)^{2n}], \mathrm{E}[\Im(Y_\chi)^{2n}] \leq 3.7 n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2n \log q^*}{e - o(1)} \right)^n .$$

We finish the proof by combining this with Lemma 4.1 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the form $|\mathtt{E}[XY]| \leq \mathtt{E}[X^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathtt{E}[Y^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for real random variables X, Y:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n}] = \mathtt{E}[(\Re(Y_\chi)^2 + \Im(Y_\chi)^2)^n] = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \mathtt{E}[\Re(Y_\chi)^{2k}\Im(Y_\chi)^{2(n-k)}] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \mathtt{E}[\Re(Y_\chi)^{4k}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathtt{E}[\Im(Y_\chi)^{4(n-k)}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq 5.7 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(n/e)^n n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(k/e)^k k^{\frac{1}{2}}((n-k)/e)^{n-k}(n-k)^{\frac{1}{2}}} k^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{4k\log q^*}{e-o(1)}\right)^k (n-k)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{4(n-k)\log q^*}{e-o(1)}\right)^{n-k} \\
&\qquad + 2\cdot 3.7^{\frac{1}{2}}(2n)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{4n\log q^*}{e-o(1)}\right)^n \\
&\leq 5.7 \sum_{k=1}^{n} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{4n\log q^*}{e-o(1)}\right)^n = 5.7 n^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{4n\log q^*}{e-o(1)}\right)^n .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.3. An important fact used in the last proof is that $\mathcal{L}_{\Re(Y_\chi)}(z)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\Im(Y_\chi)}(z)$ are entire functions, which we integrated on the circle $|z| = (2n/\log q^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, whose radius tends to infinity with n. This would not have worked with the cumulant-generating function $\log \mathtt{E}[e^{iz\Re(Y_\chi)}]$, which has poles by (16) since $I_0(z)$ has infinitely many zeros on the imaginary axis.

Now that we have bounded the moments of $|Y_\chi|^2$, we will turn this information into a bound on $\mathcal{L}_{H_q}(z)$, the moment-generating function of H_q. Instead of studying the moments H_q itself, we will study its centered moments, by defining

$$\tilde{H}_q := H_q - \mathtt{E}[H_q] = \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} W_\chi,$$

where (see (9))

$$W_\chi := |Y_\chi|^2 - \mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]. \tag{26}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Assume GRH. For q large enough, the moment-generating function of $\tilde{H}_q$ satisfies, in the range $|t| < (40\log q)^{-1}$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{H}_q}(t) \leq (1 + 184t^2(\log q)^2)^{\phi(q)}. \tag{27}$$

Proof. Let $0 \le t < (40 \log q)^{-1}$. Using the identity $\mathcal{L}_{X+c}(z) = e^{zc}\mathcal{L}_X(z)$, we have for q large enough and W_χ defined as in (26) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{W_\chi}(t) &= e^{-t\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]}\mathcal{L}_{|Y_\chi|^2}(t) \\
&= e^{-t\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n}] \frac{t^n}{n!} \\
&\le (1 - t\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^2] + 0.561 t^2 \mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]^2) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n}] \frac{t^n}{n!} \qquad (28) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} t^n \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n}]}{n!} - \frac{\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n-2}]}{(n-1)!} + 0.561 \frac{\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]^2 \mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n-4}]}{(n-2)!} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by Lemma 4.2, we have for $n \ge 1$ that

$$\mathrm{E}[|Y_\chi|^{2n}] \le 5.7 n^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{4n \log q}{e - o(1)} \right)^n .$$

Hence, applying Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{W_\chi}(t) &\le 1 + 4.65 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{4n \log q}{e - o(1)} \right)^n t^n \left(\frac{e}{n} \right)^n n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= 1 + 4.65 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n((4 + o(1)) t \log q)^n \\
&\le 1 + 184 t^2 (\log q)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

as long as $0 \le t < (40 \log q)^{-1}$. Since the W_χ are all mutually independent, the proof follows by multiplicativity:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{H}_q}(t) = \prod_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \ne \chi_0}} \mathcal{L}_{W_\chi}(t).$$

A similar argument works in the range $-(40 \log q)^{-1} < t < 0$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3, upper bound. First, by Theorem 1.2 we have for q large enough and for $(\log \log q)^2 / \log q \le \epsilon \le 1$ (recall $\tilde{H}_q = H_q - \mathrm{E}[H_q]$) that

$$\mathrm{Prob}[H_q > (1 + \epsilon)\phi(q) \log q] \le \mathrm{Prob}[\tilde{H}_q > 0.99 \epsilon \phi(q) \log q].$$

As is customary (this is Chernoff's inequality), we relate the large deviations of $\tilde{H}_q$ to its moment-generating function using Markov's inequality:

$$\mathrm{Prob}[\tilde{H}_q > V] = \mathrm{Prob}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q} > e^{tV}] \le e^{-tV} \mathrm{E}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q}].$$

Taking $V = 0.99 \epsilon \phi(q) \log q$ we obtain that

$$\mathrm{Prob}[H_q > (1 + \epsilon)\phi(q) \log q] \le \exp(-0.99 t \epsilon \phi(q) \log q) \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{H}_q}(t),$$

which from Lemma 4.4 is, for $t = \epsilon/(370 \log q)$ (we use that $\epsilon \leq 9$),

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \exp(-0.99\epsilon^2\phi(q)/370)(1 + 184\epsilon^2/370^2)^{\phi(q)} \\ &= \exp[\phi(q)(-0.99\epsilon^2/370 + \log(1 + 184\epsilon^2/370^2))] \\ &\leq \exp(-\epsilon^2\phi(q)/751), \end{aligned}$$

since for $x \geq 0$, $\log(1+x) \leq x$. We have therefore established the bound

$$\text{Prob}[H_q > (1+\epsilon)\phi(q)\log q] \leq \exp(-\epsilon^2\phi(q)/751).$$

We conclude the proof by writing

$$\text{Prob}[\tilde{H}_q < -V] = \text{Prob}[-\tilde{H}_q > V] = \text{Prob}[e^{-t\tilde{H}_q} > e^{tV}] \leq e^{-tV}\mathtt{E}[e^{-t\tilde{H}_q}],$$

and by applying the same reasoning to $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{H}_q}(-t)$, from which we deduce that

$$\text{Prob}[H_q < (1-\epsilon)\phi(q)\log q] \leq \exp(-\epsilon^2\phi(q)/751).$$

□

For the lower bound we will use the following inequality.

Lemma 4.5 (Paley-Zygmund Inequality)**.** *If $X \geq 0$ is a random variable having a second moment, then for any $0 < a < 1$ we have*

$$Prob[X \geq a\mathtt{E}[X]] \geq (1-a)^2\mathtt{E}[X]^2/\mathtt{E}[X^2].$$

Proof. Let $I \subset \mathtt{R}$ be an interval and define the random variable $\mathtt{1}_{X\in I}$ as follows:

$$\mathtt{1}_{X\in I} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X \in I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

so that $\mathtt{E}[\mathtt{1}_{X\in I}] = \text{Prob}[X \in I]$. Using this notation we have for any $U > 0$ that

$$\mathtt{E}[X] = \mathtt{E}[X\mathtt{1}_{X<U}] + \mathtt{E}[X\mathtt{1}_{X\geq U}] \leq U + \mathtt{E}[X^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}\text{Prob}[X \geq U]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the fact that $\mathtt{1}_{X\in I}^2 = \mathtt{1}_{X\in I}$. The proof follows by taking $U = a\mathtt{E}[X]$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3, lower bound. By Lemma 4.5, we have that if t and V are such that $e^{tV} \leq \mathtt{E}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q}]/2$, then

$$\text{Prob}[\tilde{H}_q \geq V] = \text{Prob}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q} \geq e^{tV}] \geq \frac{1}{4}\frac{\mathtt{E}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q}]^2}{\mathtt{E}[e^{2t\tilde{H}_q}]}.$$

Taking $V=(1+\epsilon)\phi(q)\log q-\mathtt{E}[H_q]$, we need to select t for which $e^{tV}\leq \mathtt{E}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q}]/2$. We start with χ real. By lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we have that in the range $0<t<(100\log q^*)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathtt{E}[e^{t|Y_\chi|^2}] &= 1+t\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]+\frac{t^2}{2}\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^4]+\overline{O}\left(5.7\sum_{n\geq 3} n^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(\frac{4n\log q^*}{e-o(1)}\right)^n\frac{|t|^n}{n!}\right)\\
&= 1+t\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]+\frac{t^2}{2}\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^4]+\overline{O}\left(2.28\frac{3(4|t|\log q^*)^3}{(1-4|t|\log q^*)^2}\right)\\
&= 1+t\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]+\frac{t^2}{2}\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^4]+\overline{O}\left(475(|t|\log q^*)^3\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{O}$ means that the implied constant is one. Therefore, in this range of t and for q large enough, one shows using the estimates $\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]\sim\log q^*$ and $\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^4]\sim 3(\log q^*)^2$ obtained in the proof of Theorem 1.2 (see (19) and (24)) that for $0<t<(2100\log q^*)^{-1}$,

$$\mathtt{E}[e^{tW_\chi}]=e^{-t\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]}\mathtt{E}[e^{t|Y_\chi|^2}]=1+\frac{t^2}{2}(\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^4]-\mathtt{E}[|Y_\chi|^2]^2)+\overline{O}\left(481(|t|\log q^*)^3\right).$$

Hence, for q^* large enough and for $0<t<(2100\log q^*)^{-1}$,

$$\mathtt{E}[e^{tW_\chi}]\geq e^{0.77t^2(\log q^*)^2}.$$

For complex χ, we obtain a similar estimate using (20) and (25), with the constant 0.77 replaced with 1.54. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathtt{E}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q}]=\prod_{\chi\in C(q)}\mathtt{E}[e^{tW_\chi}]\geq\exp\left(0.77t^2\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}}(\log q^*)^2\right)&\geq e^{0.75t^2\phi(q)(\log q)^2} \qquad (29)\\
&\geq 2e^{tV},
\end{aligned}$$

for q large enough, $(\log\log q)^2/\log q<\epsilon<3000^{-1}$ and $1.4\epsilon/\log q\leq t<(2100\log q^*)^{-1}$, since Theorem 1.2 shows that in this range,

$$V=(1+\epsilon)\phi(q)\log q-\mathtt{E}[H_q]\sim\epsilon\phi(q)\log q.$$

We conclude by Lemma 4.4 and (29) that

$$\mathrm{Prob}[\tilde{H}_q\geq V]\geq\frac{1}{4}\frac{\mathtt{E}[e^{t\tilde{H}_q}]^2}{\mathtt{E}[e^{2t\tilde{H}_q}]}\geq\frac{1}{4}e^{1.5t^2\phi(q)(\log q)^2}(1+184(2t\log q)^2)^{-\phi(q)}.$$

Taking $t=1.4\epsilon/\log q$ gives the result.

□

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Going from Theorem 1.3 to Conjecture 1.1 is not direct. Indeed, if we are studying the quantity $V(x;q)$ for q and x in a given range such as $(\log\log x)^{1+\delta}<q\leq x^{o(1)}$, then it is not clear that the limiting logarithmic distribution of $V(x;q)$ coincides with that of H_q. Indeed one would need to show that in the range $(\log Y)^{1+\delta}<q\leq e^{o(Y)}$, we have for every fixed $m\geq 1$ that

$$\frac{1}{Y}\int_0^Y(\phi(q)e^{-y}V(e^y;q))^m dy\sim\mathtt{E}[H_q^m]. \qquad (30)$$

This last integral is similar to a $2m$-correlation sum of low-lying zeros of Dirichlet L-functions. Indeed, expanding the m-th power we obtain from (12) under GRH that in the range $(\log Y)^{1+\delta} < q \leq e^{o(Y)}$,

$$\int_0^Y (\phi(q)e^{-y}V(e^y;q) - o(1))^m dy = \int_0^Y \left(\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \sum_{\gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi} \frac{e^{i(\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi)y}}{(\frac12 + i\gamma_\chi)(\frac12 - i\gamma'_\chi)} \right)^m dy$$

$$= \sum_{\chi_1,\dots,\chi_m \neq \chi_0} \sum_{\gamma_{\chi_1},\gamma'_{\chi_1},\dots,\gamma_{\chi_m},\gamma'_{\chi_m}} \frac{\int_0^Y e^{i(\gamma_{\chi_1}+\dots+\gamma_{\chi_m}-\gamma'_{\chi_1}-\dots-\gamma'_{\chi_m})y} dy}{(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_1})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_1})\cdots(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_m})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_m})}$$

$$= Y \sum_{\chi_1,\dots,\chi_m \neq \chi_0} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_{\chi_1},\gamma'_{\chi_1},\dots,\gamma_{\chi_m},\gamma'_{\chi_m} \\ \gamma_{\chi_1}-\gamma'_{\chi_1}+\dots,+\gamma_{\chi_m}-\gamma'_{\chi_m}=0}} \frac{1}{(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_1})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_1})\cdots(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_m})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_m})}$$

$$+ \sum_{\substack{\chi_1,\dots,\chi_m \neq \chi_0 \\ \gamma_{\chi_1},\gamma'_{\chi_1},\dots,\gamma_{\chi_m},\gamma'_{\chi_m} \\ \gamma_{\chi_1}-\gamma'_{\chi_1}+\dots+\gamma_{\chi_m}-\gamma'_{\chi_m}\neq 0}} \frac{(e^{i(\gamma_{\chi_1}+\dots+\gamma_{\chi_m}-\gamma'_{\chi_1}-\dots-\gamma'_{\chi_m})Y} - 1)(\gamma_{\chi_1}+\dots+\gamma_{\chi_m}-\gamma'_{\chi_1}-\dots-\gamma'_{\chi_m})^{-1}}{(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_1})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_1})\cdots(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_m})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_m})}. \tag{31}$$

If the last sum was running over the zeros of a single L-function, then we would run into the problem that if two zeros γ, γ' are extremely close to each other, then $e^{i(\gamma-\gamma')Y}(\gamma - \gamma')$ is very close to Y, giving a significant contribution to (31). However in the present situation we are taking an average over all Dirichlet L-functions modulo q, and hence the number of pairs of such zeros will be negligible compared to the size of the family we average over, under assumptions on statistics on zeros of Dirichlet L-functions.

We now show how a conjecture on the pair correlation of low-lying zeros of Dirichlet L-functions implies that (30) holds for $m = 1$ in the range $(\log\log x)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq x^{o(1)}$. Using Schlage-Puchta's method [SP], one shows that the last term in (31) is an error term for fixed values of q, and from this we can conclude under GRH and LI that

$$\mathtt{E}[H_q^m] = \sum_{\chi_1,\dots,\chi_m \neq \chi_0} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_{\chi_1},\gamma'_{\chi_1},\dots,\gamma_{\chi_m},\gamma'_{\chi_m} \\ \gamma_{\chi_1}-\gamma'_{\chi_1}+\dots,+\gamma_{\chi_m}-\gamma'_{\chi_m}=0}} \frac{1}{(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_1})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_1})\cdots(\frac12 + i\gamma_{\chi_m})(\frac12 - i\gamma'_{\chi_m})}.$$

(This actually follows from Theorem 1.3, with the same method as in Lemma 2.5 of [Fi2].) Thus (30) reduces to the statement that the last term in (31) is an error term for every fixed m and for values of q not necessarily fixed. Taking $m = 1$, the last term in (31) is

$$T(Y;q) := \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq \gamma'_\chi} \frac{(e^{i(\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi)Y} - 1)(\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi)^{-1}}{(\frac12 + i\gamma_\chi)(\frac12 - i\gamma'_\chi)} \ll \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\gamma_\chi \neq \gamma'_\chi} \frac{\min(Y, |\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi|^{-1})}{(1+|\gamma_\chi|)(1+|\gamma'_\chi|)},$$

and we would like to show that in the range $(\log Y)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq e^{o(Y)}$ we have $T(Y;q) = o(Y\mathtt{E}[H_q])$, that is $T(Y;q) = o(Y\phi(q)\log q)$. Arguing as in Lemma 2.6 of [Fi2] (this is

Schlage-Puchta's technique [SP]), we have introducing a parameter $U \geq 1$ that

$$T(Y;q) \ll \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \\ |\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi| \geq 1}} \frac{|\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi|^{-1}}{(1+|\gamma_\chi|)(1+|\gamma'_\chi|)} + \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \\ 0<|\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi| \leq 1 \\ \gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi > U}} \frac{\min(Y, |\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi|^{-1})}{(1+|\gamma_\chi|)(1+|\gamma'_\chi|)}$$

$$+ \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \\ 0<|\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi| \leq 1 \\ \gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \leq U}} \frac{\min(Y, |\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi|^{-1})}{(1+|\gamma_\chi|)(1+|\gamma'_\chi|)} = I + II + III. \quad (32)$$

We compare the first term with an integral:

$$I \ll \phi(q) \iint_{\substack{x,y \geq 0 \\ |x-y| \geq 1}} \frac{\log(qx)\log(qy)dxdy}{|x-y|(x+1)(y+1)} \ll \phi(q)(\log q)^2,$$

which is $o(Y\phi(q)\log q)$ as soon as $\log q = o(Y)$ (this holds in our range of q). As for the second term, we have by the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula that

$$II \ll \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\gamma_\chi \geq U} \frac{Y \log \gamma_\chi}{(1+\gamma_\chi)^2} \ll Y\phi(q)\frac{(\log(qU))^2}{U}.$$

The third term is the hardest, and requires to make the following conjecture on the pair correlation of zeros of Dirichlet L-functions:

Conjecture 5.1. *Fix $C > 0$. There exists a bounded function $W(t) \geq 0$ such that in the range $C^{-1} \leq S \leq \log q$, $1 \leq U \leq C \log Q$ we have*

$$\sum_{\chi \bmod q} \#\{0 \leq \gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \leq U : 0 < |\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi| \leq S/\log q\} \ll_C \phi(q) U \log(qU) \int_0^S W(t)dt. \quad (33)$$

Assuming this conjecture, we have by fixing $\epsilon > 0$ and using summation by parts that

$$III \leq \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \\ 0<|\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\log q} \\ \gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \leq U}} \frac{Y}{(1+|\gamma_\chi|)(1+|\gamma'_\chi|)} + \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \\ \frac{\epsilon}{\log q} \leq |\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi| \leq 1 \\ \gamma_\chi, \gamma'_\chi \leq U}} \frac{|\gamma_\chi - \gamma'_\chi|^{-1}}{(1+|\gamma_\chi|)(1+|\gamma'_\chi|)}$$

$$\ll Y\phi(q)\epsilon \log q + \phi(q)\frac{\log q}{\epsilon}\log q.$$

Collecting all these terms we obtain that

$$I + II + III \ll \phi(q)(\log q)^2 + Y\phi(q)\frac{(\log(qU))^2}{U} + Y\phi(q)\epsilon\log q + \phi(q)\frac{\log q}{\epsilon}\log q,$$

which by taking $U = (\log q)/\epsilon$ is

$$\ll \phi(q)(\log q)^2 + \epsilon Y \phi(q) \log q + \phi(q)\frac{(\log q)^2}{\epsilon},$$

a quantity which is $= o(Y\phi(q)\log q)$ when q is in the range $(\log Y)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq e^{o(Y)}$. This justifies why (30) should hold in this range.

One can justify (30) for all $m \geq 1$ with a similar argument, under an assumption on the statistics of zeros of Dirichlet L-functions.

Note that in the range $(\log x)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq x^{o(1)}$, knowing the first two moments of $e^{-y/2}V(e^y;q)$ is sufficient for justifying (4). Indeed, Chebyshev's inequality shows that

$$\text{Prob}[|H_q - \mathbb{E}[H_q]| > \epsilon\phi(q)\log q] \ll \frac{1}{\epsilon^2\phi(q)},$$

and the following argument gives the desired result in this range of q.

We now show how to support Conjecture 1.1, assuming that (30) holds in the range $(\log Y)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq e^{o(Y)}$ (the reason why we chose this upper bound is that in the range $(\log x)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq x^{o(1)}$ we only need (30) to hold for $m = 1, 2$). Theorem 1.3 shows that under GRH and LI,

$$meas\{y \leq Y : \phi(q)e^{-y}V(e^y;q) \in (\alpha,\beta)\} \sim Y\text{Prob}[H_q \in (\alpha,\beta)],$$

and so in the range $(\log Y)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq e^{o(Y)}$, Theorem 1.3 gives

$$\begin{aligned} meas\{y \leq Y : e^{-y}V(e^y;q) \notin ((1-\epsilon)\log q, (1+\epsilon)\log q)\} \\ \sim Y\text{Prob}[\tilde{H}_q \notin (-\epsilon\phi(q)\log q, \epsilon\phi(q)\log q)] \\ \leq 2Y\exp\left(-c_2\epsilon^2\phi(q)\right). \end{aligned}$$

However, since $e^{-y}V(e^y;q)$ can be understood by looking at the equidistribution of the vector $(e^{i\gamma_1 y},...,e^{i\gamma_k y}) \in \mathbb{T}^k$, we expect that the smallest value of y for which $|e^{-y}V(e^y;q) - \log q| \neq o(\log q)$ is about $y \approx \exp(c\phi(q))$. That is to say, for $q \geq (\log y)^{1+\delta}$ we have $e^{-y}V(e^y;q) \sim \log q$, which is equivalent to Conjecture 1.1.

Remark 5.2. Theorem 1.3 and Remark 1.4 even suggest the following estimate, for $(\log\log x)^{1+\delta} \leq q \leq x^{o(1)}$:

$$V(x;q) = x\mathcal{L}(q)\left(1 + O\left(\Psi(x)\sqrt{\frac{\log\log x}{\phi(q)}}\right)\right), \tag{34}$$

where $\Psi(x)$ is any function tending to infinity with x and

$$\mathcal{L}(q) := \log q - \gamma - \log(2\pi) - \sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}.$$

Remark 5.3. It would be interesting to investigate the large deviations of H_q in Theorem 1.3 for larger values of ϵ. Indeed we believe that a transition happens near $\epsilon \asymp 1$, and this could give information about $V(x;q)$ in the range $q \leq \log\log x$. For example one could make a prediction on the best possible bound for $V(x;q)$ in this range. If q is fixed, then one can show using (11) that the limiting distribution of $e^{-y}V(e^y;q)$ has double-exponentially decaying tails (this follows from Montgomery's work [Mo2]), resulting in the prediction

$$V(x;q) \ll x(\log\log\log x)^4. \tag{35}$$

Again this is for fixed values of q, and shows that a transition happens in the range $1 \leq q \leq (\log\log x)^{1+\delta}$, in transferring from (34) to (35).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Jeffrey C. Lagarias, Steven J. Miller, Hugh L. Montgomery and Maksym Radziwill for their useful comments. I also thank Greg Martin for his help with Lemma 3.3. I thank Víctor Pérez Abreu for introducing me to Berg's paper, for fruitful conversations and for inviting me to the CIMAT in Guanajuato, México. This work was accomplished partly at the Institute for Advanced Study and at the University of Michigan, and was supported by an NSERC Postdoctoral Fellowship as well as NSF grant DMS-0635607.

APPENDIX A. SOME COMMENTS ON MONTGOMERY'S CONJECTURE

Montgomery's Conjecture [Mo1] states that if we fix $\epsilon > 0$, then

$$\psi(x;q,a) = \frac{x}{\phi(q)} + O_\epsilon\left(\frac{x^{\frac12+\epsilon}}{q^{\frac12}}\right),$$

uniformly for all coprime integers $a, q \leq x^{\frac12}$. The Generalized Riemann Hypothesis implies that for $\chi \neq \chi_0$,

$$\psi(x,\chi) := \sum_{n\leq x} \Lambda(n)\chi(n) \ll x^{\frac12}(\log x)^2,$$

and thus using orthogonality relations we obtain the following standard estimate:

$$\psi(x;q,a) - \frac{\psi(x,\chi_0)}{\phi(q)} = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \overline{\chi}(a)\psi(x,\chi) \ll x^{\frac12}(\log x)^2.$$

Montgomery's Conjecture is motivated by the fact that we did not exploit any cancellations in the last estimate. Indeed, since under GRH and LI the quantity $\overline{\chi}(a)e^{-y/2}\psi(e^y,\chi)$ is distributed like a random variable of mean zero and variance asymptotically $\log q^*$, we have that the limiting distribution of $e^{-y/2}\sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q\\ \chi\neq\chi_0}} \overline{\chi}(a)\psi(e^y,\chi)$ has variance asymptotically $\phi(q)\log q$. This means that this last sum is normally of order $(\phi(q)\log q)^{\frac12+\epsilon}$, which in turn gives that $\psi(x;q,a) - \frac{\psi(x,\chi_0)}{\phi(q)}$ is normally of order $x^{\frac12}/\phi(q)^{\frac12-\epsilon}$, that is Montgomery's Conjecture should hold.

As for the quantity $\psi(x,\chi)$, we do not expect any improvement under GRH of the form

$$\psi(x,\chi) \ll \frac{x^{\frac12+\epsilon}}{q^\theta},$$

for any fixed $\theta > 0$. Indeed this last bound can readily be disproved under GRH using either (5) or (3) (in the range $x/(\log x)^A \leq q \leq x$ it can even be disproved unconditionally using (1)). Moreover, we believe that it is interesting to see what Montgomery's Conjecture implies on this quantity, using the orthogonality relations. Indeed under this conjecture we have for $\chi \neq \chi_0$ that

$$\psi(x,\chi) = \sum_{\substack{a \bmod q\\ (a,q)=1}} \chi(a)\left(\psi(x;q,a) - \frac{\psi(x,\chi_0)}{\phi(q)}\right) \ll \phi(q)\frac{x^{\frac12+\epsilon}}{q^{\frac12}} \ll q^{\frac12}x^{\frac12+\epsilon},$$

which is worse that GRH. Again, the discrepancy between this and the 'true bound' $\psi(x,\chi) \ll x^{\frac12}(\log x)^2$ comes from the fact that square-root cancellation occurs in the last sum.

References

[AS] Milton Abramowitz and Irene A. Stegun, *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables.* Reprint of the 1972 edition. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1992. xiv+1046 pp. ISBN: 0-486-61272-4.

[Ba] M. B. Barban, *The large sieve method and its applications in the theory of numbers.* Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 21 (1966) 51–102 (Russian), Russian Math. Surveys **22** (1966) 49–103.

[Be] C. Berg, *The cube of a normal distribution is indeterminate.* Ann. Probab. **16** (1988), no. 2, 910–913.

[DH] H. Davenport and H. Halberstam, *Primes in arithmetic progressions.* Michigan Math. J. **13** (1966) 485–489.

[FeMa] Andrey Feuerverger, Greg Martin, *Biases in the Shanks-Rényi prime number race.* Experiment. Math. **9** (2000), no. 4, 535–570.

[Fi1] Daniel Fiorilli, *Highly biased prime number races.* Preprint: http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.6946

[Fi2] Daniel Fiorilli, *Elliptic curves of unbounded rank and Chebyshev's Bias.* Preprint.

[FiMa] Daniel Fiorilli and Greg Martin, *Inequities in the Shanks-Rényi Prime Number Race: An asymptotic formula for the densities.* To appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.

[FiMi] Daniel Fiorilli and Steven J. Miller, *Surpassing the Ratios Conjecture in the 1-level density of Dirichlet L-functions.* http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.3896

[FG1] J. B. Friedlander, D. A. Goldston, *Variance of distribution of primes in residue classes.* Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **47** (1996), no. 187, 313–336.

[FG2] J. B. Friedlander, D. A. Goldston, *Note on a variance in the distribution of primes.* Number theory in progress, Vol. 2 (Zakopane-Kościelisko, 1997), 841–848, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.

[G] P. X. Gallagher, *The large sieve.* Mathematika **14** (1967) 14–20.

[GJMMNPP] J. Goes, S. Jackson, S. J. Miller, D. Montague, K. Ninsuwan, R. Peckner and T. Pham, *A unitary test of the ratios conjecture.* J. Number Theory **130** (2010), no. 10, 2238–2258.

[GV] D. A. Goldston, R. C. Vaughan, *On the Montgomery-Hooley asymptotic formula.* Sieve methods, exponential sums, and their applications in number theory (Cardiff, 1995), 117–142, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 237, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[H1] C. Hooley, *The distribution of sequences in arithmetic progressions.* Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Vancouver, B.C., 1974), Vol. 1, pp. 357–364. Canad. Math. Congress, Montreal, Que., 1975.

[H2] C. Hooley, *On the Barban-Davenport-Halberstam theorem. I.* Collection of articles dedicated to Helmut Hasse on his seventy-fifth birthday, III. J. Reine Angew. Math. **274/275** (1975), 206–223.

[H3] C. Hooley, *On the Barban-Davenport-Halberstam theorem. II.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) **9** (1974/75), 625–636.

[H4] C. Hooley, *On the Barban-Davenport-Halberstam theorem. IV.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) **11** (1975), no. 4, 399–407.

[H5] C. Hooley, *On the Barban-Davenport-Halberstam theorem. VII.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) **16** (1977), no. 1, 1–8.

[H6] C. Hooley, *On the Barban-Davenport-Halberstam theorem. XII.* Number theory in progress, Vol. 2 (Zakopane-Koscielisko, 1997), 893-910, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.

[H7] C. Hooley, *On theorems of Barban-Davenport-Halberstam type.* Number theory for the millennium, II (Urbana, IL, 2000), 195-228, A K Peters, Natick, MA, 2002.

[K1] Nicholas M. Katz, *On a Question of Keating and Rudnick about Primitive Dirichlet Characters with Squarefree Conductor.* To appear, International Mathematics Research Notices.

[K2] Nicholas M. Katz, *Witt Vectors and a Question of Keating and Rudnick.* To appear, International Mathematics Research Notices.

[KR] J. P. Keating and Z. Rudnick, *The Variance of the Number of Prime Polynomials in Short Intervals and in Residue Classes.* To appear, International Mathematics Research Notices.

[Ko] Emmanuel Kowalski, *The large sieve, monodromy, and zeta functions of algebraic curves. II. Independence of the zeros.* Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2008, Art. ID rnn 091, 57 pp.

[La1] Youness Lamzouri, *The Shanks-Rényi prime number race with many contestants.* Mathematical Research Letters **19** (2012), no. 03, 649–666.

[La2] Youness Lamzouri, *Large deviations of the limiting distribution in the Shanks-Rényi prime number race.* To appear in Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society.

[La3] Youness Lamzouri, *Prime number races with three or more competitors.* To appear in Mathematische Annalen. 38 pages.

[Li] J. E. Littlewood, *On the class-number of the corpus* $P(\sqrt{-k})$, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) **27** (1928), 358–372.

[Ma] Greg Martin, *Asymmetries in the Shanks-Rényi prime number race.* Number theory for the millennium, II (Urbana, IL, 2000), 403–415, A K Peters, Natick, MA, 2002.

[MaN] Greg Martin and Nathan Ng, *Nonzero values of Dirichlet L-functions in vertical arithmetic progressions.* Int. J. Number Theory, to appear (25 pages).

[Mn] William R. Monach, *Numerical investigation of several problems in number theory.* Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1980, 180 pp.

[Mo1] H. L. Montgomery, *Primes in arithmetic progressions.* Michigan Math. J. **17** (1970), 33–39.

[Mo2] Hugh L. Montgomery, *The zeta function and prime numbers.* Proceedings of the Queen's Number Theory Conference, 1979, pp. 1-31, Queen's Papers in Pure and Appl. Math., 54, Queen's Univ., Kingston, Ont., 1980.

[MoOd] Hugh L. Montgomery, Andrew M. Odlyzko, *Large deviations of sums of independent random variables.* Acta Arith. **49** (1988), no. 4, 427–434.

[N1] Nathan Ng, *Limiting distributions and zeros of Artin L-functions.* Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, 2000.

[N2] Nathan Ng, *The distribution of the summatory function of the Möbius function.* Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **89** (2004) 361-389.

[RS] Michael Rubinstein and Peter Sarnak, *Chebyshev's bias.* Experiment. Math. **3** (1994), no. 3, 173–197.

[SP] J.-C. Schlage-Puchta, *On large oscillations of the remainder of the prime number theorems.* Acta Math. Hungar. **87** (2000), no. 3, 213–227.

[Tu] Pál Turán, *Über die Primzahlen der arithmetischen Progression.* Acta Litt. Sci. Szeged **8**, 226–235 (1937).

[V] Robert C. Vaughan, *On a variance associated with the distribution of primes in arithmetic progressions.* Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **82** (2001), no. 3, 533–553.

[W] Aurel Wintner, *On the distribution function of the remainder term of the prime number theorem.* Amer. J. Math. **63**, (1941). 233–248.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, 530 CHURCH STREET, ANN ARBOR MI 48109 USA

E-mail address: `fiorilli@umich.edu`